#### The role of the ballot is to strengthen the Military Industrial Complex. **Dunlap 11**[[1]](#footnote--1)

What do all the developments of the past half-century mean after the ½ftieth anniversary of Eisenhower’s exhortation? Ledbetter claims that the warning “is as urgent today as ever.” He points not only to the “mounting long-term costs” of defense but also–somewhat disconnectedly– to the alleged “use of martial power” for the detention of terrorism suspects at Guantánamo Bay and wiretaps of Americans.45 While Eisenhower might have been disturbed by such events, Ledbetter seems to conflate these contemporary issues with the gravamen of Eisenhower’s concern: that is, the emergence of a near-conspiratorial alignment of military leaders and their analogues in the arms industry. That combination does not exist. Indeed, one might say that Eisenhower’s warning was heard and heeded–with unintended consequences. The fading of the American military-industrial complex impacts U.S. military capability; the effect on America’s Air Force is but one illustration. Whatever influence the Air Force may have enjoyed in Eisenhower’s day is long gone. Consider Air Force Lieutenant General David Deptula’s dismal assessment from Fall 2010: “[W]e have a geriatric bomber force,” Deptula concludes, and “a geriatric ½ghter force. We have a geriatric Air Force, quite frankly.”46 Aircraft age is not the only issue; numbers and sophistication are also a concern. For example, Defense News surmised that America’s current bomber fleet constitutes a “puny force against any serious adversary.”47 Even so, historian Michael Auslin of the American Enterprise Institute says that today’s budget restrictions are hitting airpower especially hard; consequently, he says, “[S]ome of the stunning joint creations of the Air Force and America’s defense industrial base . . . will likely never be repeated.” If budgetary trends are not reversed, he warns, the Air Force’s “future will look even grimmer than it does now.”48 The deterioration of America’s defense infrastructure has captured the attention of Congress. During hearings on the defense industrial base in Fall 2010, Congress acknowledged “the security challenges posed by a shrinking defense industrial base and domestic supply chain.”49 Furthermore, Congress recognized that U.S. arms makers face the “proliferation of foreign-made and counterfeit parts, outdated technology, and a depleted manufacturing workforce.”50 But there are still too few tangible indications that “an alert and knowledgeable citizenry” will compel the necessary steps to ensure the appropriate level of military-industrial muscle is met and maintained. Meanwhile, we must not ignore the fact that other nations–including potential adversaries–are strengthening their industrial base. The Pentagon’s 2010 report reveals that China’s defense industries have undergone a “broad-based transformation” since the 1990s. In fact, “[a]ugmented by direct acquisition of foreign weapons and technology, these reforms have enabled China to develop and produce advanced weapon systems that incorporate mid-1990s technology in many areas, and some systems–particularly ballistic missiles–that rival any in the world today.”51 Ominously, China’s industry is developing air capabilities to a degree that suggests China’s intention to challenge “U.S. air power in the region.”52 In other developments that show the internationalization of the arms industry, Russia and India have signed a deal to build hundreds of new “½fth generation” warplanes designed to best America’s most advanced ½ghters.53 In light of such reports, many experts are concerned that any additional cuts in U.S. defense spending “will dangerously erode the technological edge that America’s armed forces depend upon, and deserve.”54 As Ilan Berman puts it, “Stagnation [in the defense industry] threatens U.S. arms superiority.” 55 Some analysts go further. According to political commentator Zbigniew Mazurak, “[T]he U.S. is no longer unrivalled in terms of conventional weapons. Conventional threats are real and growing.”56 The problem, however, may run deeper. Some analysts observe an “anti-modern warfare prejudice” within the U.S. military itself.57 Perhaps an outgrowth of the manpower-intensive counterinsurgency strategy in vogue today, this trend runs counter to the “high-technology” emphasis that strategist Colin Gray calls “the American way in warfare.” Indeed, Gray contends, American society “cannot possibly prepare for, or attempt to fight, its wars in any other than a technology-led manner.”58 But the ability to maintain such an approach depends on the existence of a vigorous, innovative, and profitable military-industrial enterprise. Eisenhower’s dictum will always serve as a useful bellwether for the disquieting prospect of an unchecked confederation of military and industrial power. Still, in twenty-first-century America, the importance of context is becoming ever more evident. During Eisenhower’s presidency, a robust industrial base working effectively (if not always ef½ciently) with its military counterparts addressed the imperatives of the Cold War confrontation with the Soviet Union. That the perils of “misplaced power” were largely avoided is a critically important lesson. That is, inevitability need not be part of the lexicon of this issue. Were he alive today, Eisenhower undoubtedly would have recognized that dismissing the military-industrial complex as the inveterate enemy of democracy is wrong and dangerous. Thanks largely to Eisenhower’s eloquent expression of caution, the United States has shown that it can effectively limit the reach of the military-industrial establishment. Now the question may be whether controlling influences–“sought or unsought” –have taken us too far. Writing in The Wall Street Journal in late 2010, novelist Mark Helprin warns: [History] tells us that, entirely independent of economic considerations, although not a dime should be appropriated to the military if it is not necessary, not a dime should be withheld if it is. The proof of this, so often and so tragically forgotten, is that the costs of providing an undauntable defense, whatever they may be, pale before blood and defeat.59 Even the most ardent advocate of Eisenhower’s farewell address would be wise to ponder that sentiment.

#### The world is decidedly better because of the MIC---you’ll find something in this card that’s not in theirs—Data. **Drezner 13**[[2]](#footnote-0)

These sorts of trends tend to give U.S. strategists the heebie-jeebies. A staple of international relations thinking for decades has been that U.S. hegemony is the mainstay of global order. According to this "theory of hegemonic stability," **peace and prosperity** are only likely to **persist when** a liberal superpower **is prepared to act to keep** markets open **and** stamp out brewing conflict. If Mead or Robert Kagan are correct, then a United States that is both unwilling and unable to stabilize the rest of the world really should be a source of concern. Here's the thing, though: at the same time that commentators were bemoaning U.S. decline, the world was looking up. I suspect that ThinkProgress and Britain's Spectator magazine would agree on very little in politics, but this month they both ran features pointing out something important: 2013 was "the best year in human history." Their **data is** incontrovertible. **If you look at** human development **indicators,** all of the key metrics -- infant **mortality**, infectious **diseases**, per capital **income** -- **are** trending in the right direction. By the end of 2013, the smallest fraction of the world's population will be living in poverty. Both traditional and human security measures reveal the same trend. **Whether it's** violent crime, discrimination, civil or interstate war, the aggregate data shows a more peaceable world. Or, as the Spectator put it: "Every day in every way, the world grows richer, safer and smarter." If you don't believe political partisans, then buy Angus Deaton's The Great Escape and you'll discover the same message. Despite the post-2008 trend of predicting that the global order is crumbling and the world is going to hell, the opposite is transpiring. How and why can this be happening when American power is on the wane? Those fearful of disorder have made two fundamental errors in judgment. First, they assume that China, Iran, and others want to rewrite the global rules of the game. Not so. To be sure, these countries want to preserve their sovereignty and expand their sphere of influence -- and on these issues, they will clash with the United States. On the other hand, contra Mead, they will also clash with each other as well. Furthermore, Beijing, Moscow, and Tehran very much want to participate in the global economy. Indeed, the reason Rouhani is trying to negotiate a nuclear deal is to get Iran out from under the dead weight of crippling economic sanctions. And contra what everyone expected in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis, emerging markets are not eager to topple the existing global order. Indeed, the recent trade deal in Bali suggests that, if anything, they want to reinforce the existing rules of the game. The bigger error, however, has come from analysts confusing a U.S. reluctance to use military force in the Middle East with a decline in American power and influence. The truth is that **the U**nited **S**tates **still wields considerable power**, which is one reason why 2013 turned out to be such a good year. Whether one looks at global capital flows or the use of the dollar as a reserve currency, the data point in the same direction: the resilience of American economic power. And even as the sequester hits, the United States also continues to possess an unparalleled edge in military capabilities. It is true that Syria continues to hemorrhage lives and livelihoods. Even there, however, it was the threat of American force that triggered an agreement to remove Syria's chemical weapons. **U.S. military** power **has** also **helped to** tamp down conflict **in the C**entral **A**frican **R**epublic, **as well as deliver** massive humanitarian **relief to the Philippines**. Indeed, given the depths of its domestic political dysfunction, one can only imagine what America's rivals must think. In 2013 alone, the federal government couldn't evade a stupid, counterproductive budget sequester, a government shutdown, and brinksmanship with the debt ceiling. There was no agreement on immigration reform, much less on policies such as climate change, education, or infrastructure. **Despite** mounting **gridlock** and policy own goals, however, **the U**nited **S**tates **ends 2013 with** a rapidly **declining** federal budget **deficit, a surging energy sector, and** accelerating **growth** in the economy **and employment**. President Obama was justified in noting that 2014 could be a breakthrough year for the United States. The most brilliant strategists living in Moscow, Beijing, **or** Tehran **can't** displace the structural strengths of the United States. Which means that for those capitals, 2014 will prove to be a very frustrating year. Daniel W. Drezner is professor of international politics at Tufts University's Fletcher School and a contributing editor to Foreign Policy.

#### Alt causes – police violence, the prison-industrial complex, and the War on Terror reinforce militarism. The aff does nothing to eliminate these forms of militarism that outweigh on magnitude.

#### Aff can't change culture through fiat –previous laws were able to change culture because there was a cultural movement in favor of them that happens through deliberation and discussion in the public sphere. The aff can't cause that by fiating legislation.

Gun culture is inevitable – its in the cultural DNA of America. **Gollom 15** [[3]](#footnote-1)

It's not an answer because **Americans**, or at least a significant portion of the population, like or **want guns** — **it's in their** cultural **DNA**. Americans will always have guns. **Laws may come and go**, banning this weapon, or that, **but there will always be some kind of gun in the U.S.** While there has been some debate over whether gun ownership is declining in the U.S, it's still estimated that there are roughly 300 million guns in the country, which equates to nearly one gun per person. This suggests that **any power ascribed to the NRA to quash gun laws is power** that is really **derived from the people**. A 2014 Pew study looking into the demographics of gun ownership found that about a third of all Americans with children under 18 at home have a gun in their household. And it's all types of Americans who have guns. Republican Americans and Democratic Americans, male Americans  and female Americans, blue state, red state  — a cross-section of Americans have guns. Sure, guns are much more prevalent in some demographics (white, male, from the South, twice as many Republicans as Democrats, but a significant number of Independents.) But Pew found that, regionally anyway, there wasn't much difference. "Southerners were just about as likely as those living in the Midwest or the West to have a gun at home (38 per cent 35 per cent and 34 per cent, respectively)," its study found. Men were more likely than women to be gun owners, but not by much (38 per cent vs. 31 per cent). And even those who may not have guns, support gun rights. A Gallup poll last year found that **nearly three-quarters of the Americans surveyed said there should not be a ban on the possession of handguns**. Count retired Arizona Democratic congresswoman Gabby Giffords in that group. Giffords survived being shot in the head outside a Tucson supermarket in 2011. Although a proponent for tougher gun laws, she still considers herself a proud gun owner, as does her husband astronaut Mark Kelly. (A recent CBS interview with her and Kelly showed the couple at a gun range, where Gifford, partially paralyzed in her right side because of the attack, was learning to shoot with her left hand.) Gun culture in the U.S, may be rooted in the days of the early settlers, given some impetus by the American Revolution, and proliferated during and just after the Civil War. But political science professor at SUNY Cortland Robert Spitzer, who argues that gun use and ownership has been gradually declining since the 1960s, still says "**guns and the gun culture are deeply engrained in portions of American life**." "The gun culture has two parts — the hunting/sporting tradition, and the frontier/militia tradition," said Spitzer, author of Guns Across America. "The former is recreational, the latter is political and ideological. Both of these contribute to the modern attachment to guns"And all that means is that **guns, in the U.S., aren't going to disappear**

Culture and possession are two different things. **Peterson 15[[4]](#footnote-2)**

**Gun availability and gun culture are not the same. Culture is a way of life, a set of ideas and practices that constitute living in community at a particular time and place**. It includes beliefs, traditions, and processes by which one generation passes them to the next. **Gun culture**, rightly understood, **is about more than gun ownership or access to guns. Members of a responsible gun culture understand that guns are not toys but deadly weapons**; they internalize the implications of the power that guns confer and the responsibility that comes with it. **Critically, this understanding comes from a deliberate effort** on the part of elders **to transmit it to youth**; in a gun culture worthy of the name, elders communicate to youth the precious value of life. Indeed, life is so valuable as to be worthy of defense, with deadly force if necessary. At the risk of mimicking [Hillary Clinton on the stump](http://politicalticker.blogs.cnn.com/2008/04/12/clinton-touts-her-experience-with-guns/" \t "_blank), let me illustrate responsible gun culture from my own experience. I learned to shoot handguns and rifles from my grandfather at about ten years old. **The first rule**? Treat the gun at all times as if it were loaded. That means never—never—point it at anyone, with the sole exception of a real situation where you have to defend yourself or others. I grew up on superheroes like Batman, sworn never to kill, so I was a bit shocked by my grandfather’s instruction that if I found myself in a situation like those we’ve seen on the news, aim for the upper body. Stop the threat. **Protect life**. My grandfather grew up in the 1940s and ’50s, when gun ownership was much more common and less regulated, at least in Texas, New Mexico, and Utah, where his family lived. There were mass shootings and [school shootings](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_school_shootings_in_the_United_States" \t "_blank) back then, but they were less frequent and generally less deadly; [six of the ten deadliest](http://www.inquisitr.com/441261/ten-deadliest-school-massacres-in-united-states-history/" \t "_blank) school massacres occurred in the new millennium, and a seventh, Columbine, happened in 1999. **A society where citizens maintain the right to bear arms must maintain a gun culture that instills the corresponding obligation to preserve life**. The recent [rise in mass shootings](http://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonkblog/wp/2015/06/18/11-essential-facts-about-guns-and-mass-shootings-in-the-united-states/" \l "3" \t "_blank), and high levels of [suicide by gun](http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2013/05/24/suicides-account-for-most-gun-deaths/" \t "_blank) since the 1980s, suggest that as a nation we are failing at this. The [Newtown episode](http://www.newsweek.com/report-details-adam-lanzas-life-sandy-hook-shootings-286867" \t "_blank) resulted at least in part from such a failure; the shooter’s parents [reared him](http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/10/03/us/how-mass-shooters-got-their-guns.html" \t "_blank) in an environment with access to guns but did not ensure that he imbibed the respect for life that must correspond, or address his mental and emotional problems.

Too many alt causes that you don’t solve. Their author **Giroux 13[[5]](#footnote-3)**

There is little doubt that the role of the NRA is instrumental in the violence haunting American culture, or that gun control is important, but it is only one factor in the culture of symbolic and institutional violence that has such a powerful grip on the everyday cultural apparatuses and workings of American society. **The issue of violence in America goes far beyond** the issue of **gun control. When gun control is the focus — instead of a broader consideration of violence — it can actually serve to deflect the most important questions that need to be raised**. The grave reality is that violence saturates almost every aspect of North American culture. Domestically, **violence weaves through** the cultural and social landscape like a highly charged forest fire burning everything in its path. **Popular culture**, extending from Hollywood films and **sports** thuggery, to **video games**, embraces the spectacle of violence as the primary medium of entertainment. **The** real **issue** here **is** the existence of **a pedagogy of violence that** actually **makes** the power of **deadly violence attractive**.  Representations of violence dominate the media and often parade before viewers less as an object of critique than as a for-profit spectacle, just as the language of violence and punishment now shapes the U.S. culture  — **with various registers of violence** now **informing** school zero-tolerance policies, **a** bulging **prison-industrial complex**, and the growing militarization of everyday life. There is also the fact that as neoliberalism and its culture of cruelty weaves its way through the culture it makes the work place, schools, and other public spheres sites of rage, anger, humiliation, and misery, creating the foundation for blind rebellion against what might be termed intolerable conditions. **Accepting the logic of radical individual responsibility**, **too many Americans blame themselves for being** unemployed, homeless, and **isolated** and end up perceiving their misery as an individual failing and hence are vulnerable to forms of existential depression and collective rage.  We have seen such violence among students reacting to bullying and among postal workers responding to intolerable work conditions. **There is no one cause of violence, but a series of a number of causes** that range from the war on drugs and the militarization of police departments to mass incarcerations in prisons to the return from brutal wars of many trained killers suffering with PTSD.2 All of these factors combine in an explosive mix to create an dangerous culture of violence and cruelty and as Jeff Sparrow points out a “willinsgness of ordinary people to commit unthinkable atrocities.”3

#### Culture has no bearing on views on gun control. Fremling and Lott 03[[6]](#footnote-4)

Kahan and Braman reach two closely related conclusions: (1) "individuals' attitudes toward gun control are derivative of the type of social order they prize";5 and (2) "those interested in resolving the gun debate should turn their attention away from quantifying the consequences of gun control."6 These conclusions are based on the two regressions reported in Table 1 of their article.7 **Their reasoning points to the statistically significant coefficients** that they obtain for their "hierarchy-egalitarianism" and "individual- ism-solidarism" indexes.8 They are indeed correct that these coeffi- cients are statistically significant. **But statistical significance is not the same as importance: it is incorrect to claim that these variables explain much of people's views on gun control. The indexes** developed by Kahan and Braman **increase our ability to predict people's opinions** on gun control **by** merely **1.6 percent**age points (the difference in the two R2s, equal to .08 minus .064, representing the change in how much of the variation in people's opinions on gun control can be explained by adding these two variables).' **In other words, cultural attitudes explain less than 2% of attitudes on guns**. (Our guess is that if Kahan and Braman's data set allowed a more precise control of state- or area-code-fixed effects, they would find an even smaller percentage of the variation explained by their two desired control variables, and the statistical significance might well drop too.) Thus, **Kahan** and Braman **prove the opposite of what they intended**. Instead of demon- strating that people's views of social order explain a lot of the varia- tion in positions on gun control, they show that these views matter very little

#### Giroux is a loser and his hyperbolic language proves how stupid you’d be to think they solve case. Giroux no date[[7]](#footnote-5)

After getting my teaching certificate, I became a community organizer and a high school teacher. Worn thin after six years of teaching high school social studies, I applied for and received another scholarship, this one to attend Carnegie-Mellon University. I finished my course work early and spent a year unemployed while writing my dissertation. I finally got a job at Boston University. **Again politics and culture worked their strange magic as I** taught, published, and **prepared for tenure. My** tenure **experience changed my perception of liberalism forever**. Thinking that is I worked hard at teaching and publishing I would easily get tenure, I did my best to follow the rules. I was dead wrong about the rules and the alleged integrity of the tenure process. **Having published fifty articles**, two books, and given numerous talks, I went through the tenure process unanimously at every level of the university. **I was** finally **denied tenure** by John Silber, President of Boston University, who not only ignored the various unanimous tenure committee recommendations but solicited letters supporting denial of my tenure from notable conservatives such as Nathan Glazer and Chester Finn. Glazer’s review was embarrassing in that it began with the comment, “I have read all of the work of Robert Giroux.” The Dean of Education had threatened to resign if I did not receive tenure. Of course, he didn’t. Silber’s actions had a chilling effect on many faculty who had initially rallied to my support. Slowly, realizing that the tenure process was a rigged affair and that anyone who complained about it might compromise their own academic career. One faculty member apologized to me for his refusal to meet with Silber to protest my tenure decision. Arguing that he owned two condos in the city, he explained that he couldn’t afford to act on his conscience since he would be risking his investments. Of course, his conscience took a back seat in his list of assets.   
By the time I met Silber to discuss my case, I was convinced that my fate had already been decided. **Silber met me in his office, asked me why I wrote such “shit,” and made me an offer. He suggested that if I studied** the philosophy of sience and **logic with him** as my personal tutor, **I could maintain my** current **salary** and would be reconsidered for tenure in two years. The only other catch was that I had to agree not to write or publish anything during that time. I was taken aback, and responded with a joke by asking him if he wanted to turn me into George Will. He missed the humor, and I left. **I declined the offer**, was denied tenure, **and after sending off numerous job applications** finally landed a job at Miami University. **Working-class intellectuals do not fare well in the culture of higher education, especially when they are on the left**. I have been asked many times since this incident whether I would have continued the critical writing that has marked my career if I had known that I was going to be fired because of the ideological orientation of my work.  Needless to say, for me, it is better to live standing up than on one’s knees. Maybe the lesson here is that the success that many working-class kids achieve in this culture may be more accidental than the result of an unswerving commitment to the ethic of hard work and individual responsibility.

#### They don’t solve people can choose to buy any other gun if they want, those are probably sufficient to thump the link since those are the guns the actual military uses.

#### Their Giroux article concludes we need a mass movement and that gun control is insufficient to solve the problem. Giroux 16[[8]](#footnote-6)

The United States is suffering from an epidemic of violence, and much of it results in the shooting and killing of children. In announcing his package of executive actions to reduce gun violence, President Obama singled out both the gun lobby and Congress for refusing to implement even moderate gun control reforms. Obama was right on target in stating that "the gun lobby may be holding Congress hostage right now, but they cannot hold America hostage. We do not have to accept this carnage as the price of freedom." Congress's refusal to enact any type of gun control is symptomatic of the death of US democracy and the way in which money and power now govern the United States. Under a regime of casino capitalism, wealth and profits are more important than keeping the American people safe, more worthwhile than preventing a flood of violence across the land, and more valued than even the lives of young children caught in the hail of gunfire. In spite of the empty bluster of Republican politicians claiming that Obama is violating the US Constitution with executive overreach, threatening to take guns away from the American people or undermining the Second Amendment, the not-so-hidden politics at work in these claims is one that points to the collapse of ethics, compassion and responsibility in the face of a militarized culture defined by the financial elite, gun lobbies and big corporations. Such forces represent a take-no-prisoners approach and refuse to even consider Obama's call for strengthening background checks, limiting the unchecked sale of firearms by gun sellers, developing "smart gun" technologies, and preventing those on the United States' terrorist watch list from purchasing guns. These initiatives hardly constitute a threat to gun ownership in the United States. **Guns** are certainly a major problem in the United States, but they **are symptomatic of a much larger crisis**: Our country has tipped over into a new and deadly form of authoritarianism. **We have become one of the most violent cultures on the planet and regulating guns does not get to the root of the problem.** [Zhiwa Woodbury touches on this issue at Tikkun Daily](http://www.tikkun.org/tikkundaily/2015/10/23/the-american-disease-of-mass-killing/" \t "_blank), writing: We are a country of approximately 300 million people with approximately 300 million firearms - a third of which are concealable handguns. Each one of these guns is made for one purpose only - to kill as quickly and effectively as possible. **The idea that some magical regulatory scheme, short of confiscation, will somehow prevent guns from being used to kill people is laughable**, regardless of what you think of the NRA. Similarly, mentally ill individuals are responsible for less than 5% of the 30,000+ gunned down in the U.S. every year. In the current historical conjuncture, gun violence makes a mockery of safe public spaces, gives rise to institutions and cultural apparatuses that embrace a deadly war psychology, and trades on fear and insecurity to undermine any sense of shared responsibility. It is no coincidence that the violence of prisons is related to the violence produced by police in the streets; it is no coincidence that the brutal masculine authority that now dominates US politics, with its unabashed hatred of women, poor people, Black people, Muslims and Mexican immigrants, shares an uncanny form of lawlessness with a long tradition of 20th century authoritarianism. As violence moves to the center of American life, it becomes an organizing principle of society, and further contributes to the unraveling of the fabric of a democracy. Under such circumstances, the United States begins to consider everyone a potential criminal, wages war with itself and begins to sacrifice its children and its future. **The political stooges**, who have become lapdogs of corporate and financial interests, and refuse out of narrow self- and financial interests to confront the conditions that create such violence, **must be held accountable** for the deaths taking place in a toxic culture of gun violence. **The condemnation of violence** cannot be limited to police brutality. Violence does not just come from the police. In the United States, there are other dangers emanating from state power that punishes whistleblowers, intelligence agencies that encourage the arrests of those who protest against the abuse of corporate and state power, and a corporate-controlled media that trades in ignorance, lies and falsehoods, all the while demanding and generally "receiving unwavering support from their citizens," [as Teju Cole has pointed out in The New Yorker](http://www.newyorker.com/culture/cultural-comment/unmournable-bodies" \t "_blank). Yet, **the only reforms we hear about are for safer gun policies,** mandatory body-worn cameras for the police and more background checks. These may be well-intentioned reforms, **but they do not get to the root of the problem, which is a social and economic system that trades in death in order to accumulate profits.** What we don't hear about are the people who trade their conscience for supporting the gun lobby, particularly the NRA. These are the politicians in Congress who create the conditions for mass shootings and gun violence because they have been bought and sold by the apostles of the death industry. These are the same **politicians** who **support the militarization of everyday life**, who trade in torture, who bow down slavishly to the arms industries and who wallow in the handouts provided by the military-industrial-academic complex. These utterly corrupted politicians are killers in suits whose test of courage and toughness was captured in one of the recent Republican presidential debates, when candidate Ben Carson was asked by Hugh Hewitt, a reactionary right-wing talk show host, if he would be willing to kill thousands of children in the name of exercising tough leadership. As if killing innocent children is a legitimate test for leadership. This is what the **warmongering politics of hysterical fear with its unbridled focus on terrorism** has come to - a future that will be defined by moral and political zombies who represent the real face of terrorism, domestic and otherwise. Clearly, the cause of violence in the United States will not stop by merely holding the politicians responsible. **What is needed is a mass political movement willing to challenge and replace a broken system that gives corrupt and warmongering politicians excessive political and economic power.** Democracy and justice are on life support and the challenge is to bring them back to life not by reforming the system but by replacing it. This will only take place with the development of a politics in which the obligation to justice is matched by an endless responsibility to collective struggle.
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